

great deal in this crisis, and China bears much of the responsibility.

Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for the chance to address the body. We are looking at putting forward a resolution calling on any future dialog with North Korea to include a human rights component. Along with the discussion of missile technology and nuclear technology, it desperately needs a human rights component, as we did in negotiations with the former Soviet Union on missiles and nuclear weapons. We also included a Helsinki human rights component. This discussion needs a human rights component as well.

Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Connecticut for allowing me to step in front of him to speak, and I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Asia Times, July 14, 2006]

NORTH KOREANS LET THEIR FEET DO THE TALKING

(By Donald Kirk)

SEOUL.—The ruckus over the North Korean missile shots has exploded into a war of words that's endangering South Korea's efforts to shrug off the crisis as a minor obstacle on the path to North-South reconciliation.

South Korea appears to have awakened to the depth of the difficulties with the North in the breakdown of ministerial-level talks this week in the port city of Pusan. Far from finding the basis for one of those face-saving statements that often emerge from North-South Korean talks, the two sides cut off the dialogue on Thursday a day earlier than expected after finding no ground for agreement.

The sides were absurdly far apart, according to reports from the closed-door sessions, with North Korea insisting the missiles were needed for the defense of all Korea, North and South, not just North Korea.

Finally, the North Koreans walked out on Thursday after South Korea's Unification Minister Lee Jeong-seok flatly rejected their claim that the North's Songun or military first policy covered both Koreas equally. The talks were originally to have gone on until Friday.

Lee, a one-time leftwing activist who has sought mightily to paper over North-South differences, got nowhere in efforts at persuading North Korea to return to six-party talks on its nuclear weapons.

At the same time, he rejected North Korean demands for half a million tons of rice and several hundred thousand tons of fertilizer to help feed starving North Koreans at a time when the government is investing heavily in missiles and nuclear weapons.

The failure of the talks is ominous since they were "ministerial level". The North Korean delegation was led by Kwong Ho-ung, chief cabinet counselor. The North Koreans, before boarding a direct flight from Pusan to Pyongyang on Air Koryo, the North Korean airline, said "our delegation was no longer able to stay in Pusan" as a result of the South Koreans' "reckless" insistence on raising the issue of the missile tests.

Suggesting the seriousness of the collapse, a statement distributed by the North Koreans said the North now had no dialogue partners in the South "due to the South Korean side's unreasonable" position. The statement said they had not come to Pusan to discuss military matters or six-party talks.

South Korean leaders, caught between conflicting demands from the United States,

North Korea, China and Japan as well as their vituperative critics and foes on their own home front, remain determined to head off U.S. and Japanese attempts to bring about a debate in the United Nations Security Council on sanctions against North Korea.

South Korean officials firmly favor a resolution introduced by China and Russia that "strongly deplores" the missile tests and calls on all nations to "exercise vigilance in preventing supply of items, goods and technologies" for North Korean missiles. The resolution also asks them "not to procure missiles or missile-related items" from North Korea.

The fear in the South is that a debate on a much tougher Japanese resolution, banning North Korea from deploying or testing missiles, importing or exporting missiles or weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear warheads, or developing any of them, would greatly exacerbate tensions.

South Korean strategists believe such a strong resolution would arm Japan with the pretext for following through on threats to attack North Korean missile sites. In fact, South Korea has responded with far greater alarm to Japan's floating this idea than to the actual missile tests, while the rift between Japan and South Korea has turned into what appears as an unbridgeable chasm.

A spokesman for South Korea's President Roh Moo-hyun blasted Japan for what he called a "rash and thoughtless" threat. It was, he said, "a grave matter for Japanese cabinet ministers to talk about the possibility of a preemptive strike and the validity of the use of force against the peninsula".

U.S. officials, led by Christopher Hill, privately warned Japan against a preemptive strike, reminding the Japanese that open discussion of that possibility only invited an adverse response from South Korea as well as China.

Such talk, they note, also plays into North Korea's propaganda machine, which often emits noises about U.S. plans for a "preemptive strike", citing that danger as a rationale for the need for nuclear weapons.

The U.S., however, sides with Japan in the United Nations, and no U.S. official adopts a harder line than the U.S. ambassador to the U.N., John Bolton, a tough-talker from his days as under secretary of state for arms control during President George W. Bush's first term.

Bolton and Japan's U.N. Ambassador Kenzo Oshima have engaged in the diplomatic nicety of calling the Chinese and Russian draft "a step in the right direction". South Korean officials believe, however, they may hold off on supporting it, calling instead for a debate that gives both of them a forum for lambasting North Korea.

Oshima found "very serious gaps" in the Chinese and Russian draft, while Bolton seemed anxious to have the Japanese resolution submitted to a vote despite the certainty of Chinese and Russian vetoes. "We're prepared to proceed at an appropriate time with a vote," said Bolton, and "let every one draw their own conclusions."

The standoff over how to deal with North Korea comes at a critical time in relations between the U.S. and South Korea. A U.S. team has just arrived in Seoul for talks about creating an "independent wartime command" for South Korean forces rather than a unified command led by a U.S. general.

The creation of such a command marks a major—and controversial—departure from the system dating from the Korean War placing all forces under a single American general in the event of war.

The U.S. is also consolidating its bases in South Korea, moving them south of Seoul in

the face of widespread opposition by activists and farmers resentful of the loss of their land while the U.S. scales down its forces, now totaling 29,500 troops, down from 37,000 three years ago.

Activists and farmers also oppose efforts by the U.S. and South Korea to come up with a free trade agreement (FTA). More than 20,000 people demonstrated in a heavy downpour in central Seoul on Wednesday, charging the agreement would deprive farmers and factory workers of their livelihoods.

While the North Koreans walked out of the talks in Pusan, U.S. negotiators boycotted a session of the FTA talks in Seoul on pharmaceuticals. The U.S. claims a plan for South Korea to reimburse patients for the purchase of drugs made in South Korea makes drug imports here virtually impossible.

It was a bad day all around for U.S. negotiators. Hill, in Beijing, said he was finally taking off for Washington after getting nowhere in efforts at persuading China to bring North Korea back to the table. He tried, however, to see the impasse from China's viewpoint.

"China has done so much for that country," he said, "and that country seems intent on taking all of China's generosity and then giving nothing back." The Chinese, he said, "are as baffled as we are."

The U.S. and China, however, seemed in complete disagreement on U.S. Treasury Department restrictions on firms doing business with North Korea. Hill had nothing to say in response to the official Chinese hope, expressed by a spokesman, that the U.S. would "make a concession regarding the sanctions issue and take steps that will help restore the six-party talks".

The U.S. denies it's imposing "sanctions" and says the restrictions are to counter North Korean counterfeiting. Hill has repeatedly dismissed the topic as a matter for the Treasury, not the State Department, while North Korea has made the issue the reason for not returning to talks on its nukes.

ENERGY PRICES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, let me, first of all, say to my colleague from Kansas, I am always delighted to hear his comments and thoughts.

I wanted to be here earlier to discuss with our colleague and friend from North Dakota, Senator DORGAN, the growing problem we are all hearing about from our constituents all across this country, and that is the ever-rising cost of gasoline and petroleum-related products. There has been a staggering increase in the price of oil and gasoline which is having a huge impact on working families in this country. Their weekly earnings have risen less than one-half of 1 percent over the last 5 years, yet the cost of gasoline has more than doubled over that same period of time.

These charts and graphs give an indication of what has happened to the price. Beginning in 2000, it was \$1.47. Just last week, in my hometown in Connecticut, the price ranged from \$3.15 per gallon to \$3.35 per gallon, depending upon the quality of fuel you were buying, and the national average is creeping closer to \$3.00 per gallon. We have seen the price of oil soar from just over \$30 per barrel in 2001 to an excessive \$75 per barrel this week.

Most of us are aware, with the existing product from previously dug wells around the world, large profits can be made at \$30 and \$40 per barrel. So when you start talking about \$75 per barrel, you get some indication of the level of profits that are being made.

I mentioned what it is like for people out there who are struggling to make ends meet and hold their families together. Weekly earnings have risen only .4 percent since 2001, adjusted for inflation, while gasoline prices have risen 130.5 percent since that same year, adjusted for inflation. When you start talking about people on fixed incomes or people earning the minimum wage, the problem becomes more pronounced. We have gone 9 years now with no increase whatsoever in the federal minimum wage. We tried here only a few weeks ago, prior to the Fourth of July recess, for a \$2.10 per hour increase in the minimum wage over the next several years, from \$5.15 per hour to \$7.25 per hour. That is a very modest increase in that minimum wage, but it would make a huge difference for people out there who are trying to make ends meet.

Again, we have a limited time to talk about this, but Senator DORGAN and I are once again going to ask our colleagues to consider the idea of a rebate going back to people who are trying to make ends meet. We ask, when you have profits in excess of \$40 per barrel, to either invest those profits back into the development of new product or new technologies or rebate part of those profits back to consumers.

I know the Presiding Officer cares deeply about this issue and has lectured us on numerous occasions about the importance of supply. I don't fault the industry for trying to make a profit. What I would like to know is, are the companies investing in production, alternative sources of energy, and new technology? I would like to know they are going to do something, in addition to making a profit, that will actually increase our domestic supply.

We wake up today to find the region of the world on which we depend tremendously for our supplies is literally aflame, a tinderbox that is exploding while we are gathered here. Yet we sit around here almost pretending that nothing is wrong as we continue to watch oil and gasoline prices skyrocket and oil companies record huge profits.

One of the major oil companies, in its 2004 annual report, told its shareholders:

We achieved the highest net income in our history, \$18.2 billion. This was 48 percent higher than in 2003, as a result of higher oil and gas prices.

So they recognize themselves that their profits are occurring because of these skyrocketing prices. Why not put some of those resources into developing alternatives, or doing a better job to see to it we become less dependent on the Venezuelas and the Middle East for our supplies? And if not, why not rebate some of the profits back to people who are struggling to make ends meet?

Senator DORGAN and I are asking the leaders to provide us a limited amount of time to debate oil and gasoline prices and other energy issues. Nothing has captivated the attention of our public as has this issue. I don't know why we can't find some time to talk about ideas to provide relief to people we represent. We spent more time in the last couple of weeks talking about gay marriage and flag burning. How about gasoline prices?

How about saying to the American public: Listen to the ideas we have to reduce the pressure you are feeling economically. That would be a welcome surprise to most Americans, to hear us talk about something they deeply care about. At the appropriate time, the Senator from North Dakota and I will be offering some language, once again asking our colleagues to join us in a bipartisan way to see if we can't encourage the industry to do something more than just brag about its profits.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is 4 minutes 12 seconds on Republican side. Who yields time?

Mr. GREGG. We yield back the remainder of time in morning business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. I thank the Chair.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 5441, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5441) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Feinstein amendment No. 4556, to amend chapter 27 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the unauthorized construction, financing, or, with reckless disregard, permitting the construction or use on one's land, of a tunnel or subterranean passageway between the United States and another country and to direct the United States Sentencing Commission to modify the sentencing guidelines to account for such prohibition.

Thune/Talent amendment No. 4610, to establish a program to use amounts collected from violations of the corporate average fuel economy program to expand infrastructure necessary to increase the availability of alternative fuels.

Vitter amendment No. 4615, to prohibit the confiscation of a firearm during an emergency or major disaster if the possession of such firearm is not prohibited under Federal or State law.

Menendez modified amendment No. 4634, to provide that appropriations under this Act may not be used for the purpose of providing certain grants, unless all such grants meet certain conditions for allocation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MURKOWSKI). Who yields time?

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, we are now back on the Homeland Security appropriations bill. My hope is, although this is not formalized as a unanimous consent agreement yet—but the understanding I have with the Senator from Washington was that the Senator from Pennsylvania would speak for about 15 minutes and then the opposition, if they wish to speak, would speak for 15 minutes. Then the Senator from Arizona, Senator KYL, would speak for about 10 minutes on his amendment. Then there will be 10 minutes in opposition. Then we will go to a vote on those two amendments. Either—if they are merged, one vote; if they are not merged, two votes. Then we will go back to the Menendez amendment, the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey.

I understand Senator COLLINS wishes to speak on that, and Senator LEAHY wishes to speak. I am not sure what the time understanding is before we can get to a vote on the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey, but my hope would be we could go to a vote fairly promptly on that amendment after completing the votes on the amendments of Senator KYL and Senator SANTORUM.

I see the Senator from Washington is here. Is that her understanding?

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I would let my colleagues know we have several Members who want to come to the floor to speak. We are checking with several of the relevant committees. I am hoping over the course of the next hour or so we can figure out the timing on the votes the chairman requests.

Mr. GREGG. At this time, I think the Senator from Pennsylvania is ready to go and we will get started.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 4575

Mr. SANTORUM. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 4575 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to setting aside the pending amendment? Without objection, the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) for himself and Mr. KYL, proposes an amendment numbered 4575.

Mr. SANTORUM. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase the number of border patrol agents, to 2,500 agents, and offset by increasing the availability of reverse mortgages for seniors)

On page 70, line 3, strike "\$5,285,874,000; of which" and insert "\$5,459,135,000; of which \$459,863,000 shall be for 1,500 additional Border Patrol Agents and the necessary operational and mission support positions, information technology, relocation costs, and training for those agents; of which".